



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

fw
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/802,299	03/16/2004	Peter Tsai	04136-URS	3892
33804	7590	11/22/2005	EXAMINER	
SUPREME PATENT SERVICES POST OFFICE BOX 2339 SARATOGA, CA 95070			WUJCIAK, ALFRED J	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		3632		

DATE MAILED: 11/22/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/802,299	TSAI, PETER
Examiner	Art Unit	
Alfred Joseph Wujciak III	3632	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 March 2004.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) 9 is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1, 6 and 7 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) 2-5, 8 and 10 is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 16 March 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ .

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This is the first Office Action for the serial number 10/802,299, BADMINTON NET RETAINER, filed on 3/16/04.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 6-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 6, line 1, "post" is indefinite because it cites combination/subcombination problem. "Post" is not being positively cited in the preamble of claim 1.

Claim 7 is rejected as depending on rejected claim 6.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent # 5,367,750 to Ward in view of US Patent # 918,905 to Pond.

Ward teaches a retainer (figure 1) comprising an elongate rod (14) having first and second ends and a pair of resilient arms (46) extending from the first end of the rod toward the

second end in a diverging manner. The retainer includes a pair of resilient straps (48) extending transversely from the rod. The arm defines a notch receivingly engageable with a portion of a wall of structure.

Ward teaches the retainer but fails to teach a ring formed on the second end having a central bore. Pond teaches the ring (13) having a central bore. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Ward's retainer with ring as taught by Pond to provide alternative shape for mounting on a tubular/cylindrical object on the retainer.

Ward teaches the pair of resilient straps but fails to teach the straps having length that partially overlap each other. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have increased the length of straps to overlap each other to secure an object on the rod.

In regards to claim 6, Ward teaches the retainer is designed to mount in a hole of structure but fails to teach the structure is a post with tubular portion. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the structure of Ward with post to provide support for an object to be mounted on cylindrical object.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 2-5, 8 and 10 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 7 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 9 is allowed.

In regard to claims 2-5, the prior art fails to teach wherein the straps of the retainers have free ends that form secondary rings overlapping each other for the extension of the net strap therethrough. In regard to claims 7-10, the prior art fails to teach the locking bar being resilient and having expanded portion removably receivable in and engageable with a recess defined in each arm to prevent the arm from being deflected.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

US Patent # 5,762,397 to Venuto et al.

US Patent # 5,906,342 to Kraus

US Patent # 4,371,137 to Anscher

US Patent # 3,088,702 to Orenick et al.

US Patent # D.302,938 to Fujioka

US Patent # 4,728,068 to Rivkin

US Patent # 3,980,263 to Okuda

GB Patent Application # 2,080,398 to Wright


Venuto et al., Kraus, Anscher, Orenick et al., Fujioka, Rivkin, Okuda and Wright teach a holder having arms for mounting in the hole to support an object on the structure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alfred Joseph Wujciak III whose telephone number is (571) 272-6827. The examiner can normally be reached on 8am-4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Olszewski can be reached on (571) 272-6815. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Alfred Joseph Wujciak III
Examiner
Art Unit 3632



11/9/05